Application Serial No.: 09/506,377 Attorney Docket No.: 04329.2231

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-19 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-18 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated April 22, 2004, Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the drawings were objected to, and Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-19 were allowed. Following this response, Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-19 remain in this application, Claims 4 and 8 being canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Objection to the Drawings and Amendment to the Specification

In the Final Office Action dated April 22, 2004, the Examiner objected to the drawings, stating that they do not include item "17" as recited on page 12, line 16. The specification has been amended to address the drawing objection. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to the specification overcomes the objection to the drawings. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to the specification adds no new matter, at least because the amended text is supported by the application; specifically, by the drawings as filed.

II. Allowance of Claims

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner pass allowed Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-19, as well as claims 4 and 8, to issue.

Application Serial No.: 09/506,377 Attorney Docket No.: 04329.2231

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the

reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the

pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the

Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that

were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other

elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the

preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other

By:

bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,

GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 21, 2004

D. Kent Stier

Reg. No. 50,640

(404) 653-6559